

REMARKS

Claim 57 was amended to provide the appropriate dependency as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 15, 18 and 49-51 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 5,461,655 Vuylsteke et al.

Claims 4, 16-17 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vuylsteke.

At the outset, Applicant would like to point out that there is a semantic difficulty between the terms used by Vuylsteke et al. and that used in the present invention. The present application is believed to use the correct nomenclature, but for purposes of clarity, Applicant will try to explain what the differences are. When Vuylsteke et al. refers to a “residual digital image 31”, that is, in fact, the “base digital image” used by Applicant. See Vuylsteke et al., column 7, lines 20-23. When Vuylsteke et al. refers to a “detail digital image 31”, that is, in fact, the “residual digital image” used by Applicant. See Vuylsteke et al., column 7, lines 8-13.

Now attempting to read the Vuylsteke et al. reference in view of claim 1 of the present application and referring to element c), Vuylsteke et al. do not generate, using Applicant’s terminology, a noise reduced base image. In other words, Vuylsteke et al. do apply a noise reduction filter to a base digital image (using Applicant’s nomenclature). In column 7, Vuylsteke et al. refer to a noise reduced detail image 33. In other words, Vuylsteke et al. apply a noise reduction filter to their detail image 33. In Applicant’s terms, they apply their noise reduction filter to a residual image (see page 9, lines 11-19 of the present application). Clearly, Applicant does not do that. Applicant’s claimed structure has an advantage in that any noise reduction filter appropriate for filtering digital images can be applied to the base digital image (see page 9, lines 4-19 of the present application). In contrast, Vuylsteke et al. require a specialized filter designed specifically to work with the detail image.

Applicant believes that there is no motivation or suggestion in Vuylsteke et al. to perform the claimed operations set forth in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 defines a new and unobvious structure, and claim 1 is believed to be

allowable. The remaining claims in this case all depend upon claim 1 and should be allowed along with it.

Edward Gindele, the inventor in this case, has carefully reviewed the Vuylsteke et al. patent and, if the Examiner has difficulty understanding Applicant's position that the nomenclature refers to different elements in Vuylsteke et al. and the present case, Applicant's attorney should be notified and we are willing to conduct a telephone interview where this matter could be discussed with the inventor.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and, if there are any problems with these changes, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 22,363

Raymond L. Owens/JMD
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone 585-477-4653
Facsimile 585-477-4646